DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 313 88 EA 001 376

By- Filene, Ron; Kief, Gary

A STUDENT REPORT ON STUDENT AND TEACHER REACTIONS TO MODULAR SCHEDULING AND INDEPENDENT STUDY AT SOUTH HILLS HIGH SCHOOL DURING THE 1966-67 SCHOOL YEAR.

Covina-Valley Unified School District, Covina, Calif.

Spons Agency- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Pub Date Oct 67

Note- 38p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60

Descriptors- ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, AUDIOVISUAL AIDS, *COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS, EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT, HOMEWORK, *INDEPENDENT STUDY, LESSON PLANS, RESOURCE CENTERS, ROTATION PLANS, *SCHEDULE MODULES, *STUDENT REACTION, STUDENT ROLE, *TEACHER ATTITUDES, TEACHER ROLE, TEACHING STYLES, TEAM TEACHING

This report, prepared by two students, deals with student and teacher reactions to a recently instituted program of flexible scheduling and independent study time at South Hills High School, Covina, California. Questionnaires were distributed to teachers and students during the first and second years of the program. Interpretation of the first-year results was made while the authors were students at South Hills High School. This document reports the second-year results and gives analysis of the entire program after the authors had gained the perspective of a year at college. Emphasis of interpretation is on the relevance of the program in preparing students for higher education, relevance of the program in inducing student maturity, and success of the program in making school more interesting and enjoyable to the students. It is concluded that the program was generally successful, and its continuation with some modification of funding and teacher behavior is recommended. (TT)

66-1537-88
EA

A STUDENT REPORT

on

STUDENT AND TEACHER REACTIONS

to
Modular Scheduling
and
Independent Study

at
SOUTH HILLS HIGH SCHOOL
during the 1966-67 school year

by
Ron Filene and Gary Kief

(This study of educational innovation was sponsored by the PRISM Project, (Provision for Restructure of Independent Study Models) Title III, U. S. Office of Education Grant)

COVINA-VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
October 1967

EA 001 376
ED021313

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDENT REPORT

on

STUDENT AND TEACHER REACTIONS

to
Modular Scheduling
and
Independent Study

at
SOUTH HILLS HIGH SCHOOL
during the 1966-67 school year

by
Ron Filene and Gary Kief

(This study of educational innovation was sponsored by the PRISM Project, (Provision for Restructure of Independent Study Models) Title III, U. S. Office of Education Grant)

COVINA-VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
October 1967

FOREWORD

The time in which we live demands assessment of most everything we do. The time in which we live demands that we provide realistic opportunities for young people in our high school.

A comprehensive high school certainly does not just happen -- but it makes some demands for its fullfillment and development upon students, teachers, and administration -- to provide opportunities to meet the individual needs of all students at both ends of the educational spectrum and in the middle also.

To do this, assessment is one of the keys to building and developing a comprehensive high school. Too many times we implement a program, a plan, a curriculum study, but we never assess its impact on those it was meant for.

If our school is to meet the individual needs of our students and provide comprehensive education for all those who enter our halls, a "dialogue" must be created whereby teachers, students, and administration share ideas, evaluate, and plan a mode of action, develop a plan to design and change curriculum.

The Kief-Filene Report is one of the assessments, with our "dialogue," of teachers, students, and administrators regarding modular scheduling and Independent Study. Ron Filene, a sophomore at Stanford University, and Gary Kief, a sophomore at the University of Southern California, returned in the Spring of 1967 to implement a second survey and tabulate reactions. These two outstanding young men returned to South Hills High School from their first year in college with new ideas and new insights, to a student body and faculty that had gained better understanding of what we are doing and what we proposed to do because of their first report regarding the program at South Hills High School.

When one compares the first report with the second report we can see that there have been some changes in attitude and productivity on the part of students, teachers, administration. We are proud of most of the changes.

The purpose of assessment is to give us a base line to make decisions, changes, and plans for the future. The success of assessment at South Hills High School depends upon the understanding and development of the "dialogue" in our emerging student-teacher partnership.

Ramon C. Cortines
Project PRISM Director
South Hills High School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY OF FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE	2
CONCLUSION OF FACULTY SURVEY	15
SUMMARY OF STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE	16
APPENDIX	26
Teacher Questionnaire	27
Student Questionnaire	30
CONCLUSION	33
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	34

INTRODUCTION

We start. There is no easier and no harder way to begin a report. Once again we have taken it upon ourselves to comment on something far bigger than ourselves, far bigger than those hundreds of individuals who comprise the South Hills High School process. Though this giant can be described in one word, education, no number of pages could even bring partial focus to all its meaning, problems, desires, and failures. To set ourselves up as critics or innovators requires that we possess the qualities of philosopher, psychologist, and sociologist; however, we have simply put on the shoes of an educator and hope all can be measured by our stride.

This report can not provide the same perspective as last year's. Last year we were students at South Hills High School, part of this educational process; we were in a position where criticism could be heaped upon the total process, because we were directly involved in it. Possibly we used the device of self-criticism too much and at the expense of concrete proposals, yet it is hard to divorce ourselves from ourselves and see exactly what is desirable. This year we have that third-person perspective which allows for a completely rational approach. We even offer the best of political scopes evidenced by the fact that Gary remained right here and Ron left for school. An added attraction is the combined flavor of San Francisco and Los Angeles--without the smog, we hope. We have now been to college, whereas we only anticipated it last year, and in such a position we understand what the culmination of high school should be and where it should direct its graduates.

There is much to be said that we will leave to implicit thought, dictated by the difference in our relative position. But one thing remains clear to us: education is a life long process if we desire to live it, and in such a state of mind we are never divorced from any level of the system, be it kindergarten or college. It is in this state of mind that we approach our duty to education. Our only hesitation is that we may fail to create, we may fail to gain insights by which we motivate others--but hesitation completes nothing.

A report each time it is renewed gains strength. For we are no longer just making a survey, but we are denoting direction and making a judgment by comparing it to the report of the previous year. The strength of any report is its concrete proposals for betterment, but in which direction betterment lies can only be perceived by recognizing where we are. Last year we located our position; this year we will look for and, hopefully, toward improvement.

If we want to be an explorer of the unknown we must cut our own path. We so desire. We start.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Last year as students, although we strived for an unbiased position, we leaned toward the administrative viewpoint as the correct outline of the system. This year we are not faced with where we are, but rather where we are headed. With this in mind it will be easier for us to use ourselves, administrators, teachers and last years report on equal terms, putting ideas in their proper perspective.

Absent from this year's evaluation then, will be the guideline to proper responses. There is no right and wrong, and in the end it will still be only our opinion, which we feel is absolutely correct, but is open to each reader's criticism with respect to his opinion.

1. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF STUDENT USE OF INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME (IST)?

Quantitatively the responses to this question closely resembled last year's survey; teachers felt that it was a toss-up between "good" and "fair." But there is another side to this question. Last year the prevailing attitude was one of hope and the almost certain knowledge that under the flexible system the use of IST could only improve. The overwhelming hope is gone, to say nothing of the certain knowledge. Where there were a number of teachers who felt use of IST was "excellent" last year, this year there were none, and four who felt it was "poor." Most teachers were in agreement that only 20-30% of the student body can effectively handle their independent study time, which "depends on maturity."

An important aspect of IST is how the system teaches responsibility. There are two forms of responsibility which should be recognized. First is behavior: Can students handle independent time in an orderly manner? The second level is: Can the students handle independent study time in a scholarly manner? The second part of teaching responsibility is that of responsibility to oneself. It must be recognized that this kind of responsibility is only manifested in a scholarly approach and that this is only one area in which some students are stronger than others.

In light of the previous remarks it is our contention that IST should not be excluded from any individual's schedule who shows he can behave, but rather it should be limited. And conversely, those who use IST in accordance with the second level of responsibility should, if possible, be allowed more freedom.

The real question is: What is appropriate use of IST? The answers are as numerous as the individuals involved. But one thing is certain: IST is part of an educational system and, therefore, it must be used primarily for educational pursuits, which in high school is homework. The independence that belongs to the student should be that of making the decision about which assignment to do at what time, rather than should he do an assignment. Thus, it follows that an assignment of some sort should be at hand to justify the giving of IST. This does not mean that the assignment need be written or immediate.

Last year we stated, "If a number of the students can be instructed as to the proper use of IST, it might lead to a spreading of ideas throughout the group of misusers." This instruction is still imperative and possibly lacking; but we feel it is necessary to point out the converse, that misusers can influence others to be misusers. Possibly stronger than any other force operating on the student at school is peer group pressure. Also it is fair to say that usually the most vocal groups are the misusers. The conclusion is easy: People fear exclusion from social groups. To combat exclusion they follow peer pressure and goof off during IST with the hope that admission to the group will follow. It is true that this is an overly simplified example, but we believe it is a big problem. To combat this type of decay in the attitude of the student body, those individuals who continually abuse the system's advantages and incite others to do the same should be relocated in another school within the district.

The effect of PRISM is a final topic appropriate in answering this question. Last year many teachers, administrators and the authors felt that one of the answers to the problems of IST would be found in the expansion of audio-visual materials, especially that under the title of PRISM. Very few teachers included PRISM in their response. We believe this is due to the fact that PRISM is limited to a budget which, in view of its immense needs, can be termed as very small. Also, as it is restricted to assignment by teachers, it is not included to any great extent with IST facilities. PRISM will be discussed later, but its expansion for use at anytime by any department is a necessity.

2. DO YOU INSTRUCT YOUR STUDENTS IN THE PROPER USE OF INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME?

Bad questions receive no information. All teachers do give instruction. The question is: how do they instruct and what do they instruct.

Before discarding the responses to this poor question, it should be noted that the administration has required IST orientation to be done in just English classes. Thus, one of two conclusions can be drawn from the fact that each teacher instructs his students regardless of previous orientation. Either the administrative orientation is incomplete, in which case teachers must take the task upon themselves; or each teacher sees IST differently. If the latter is the case, then we can only conclude that between departments there is very little interplay of ideas.

3. DO YOU PROVIDE YOUR STUDENTS WITH A WEEKLY CLASS PLAN?

By an even larger margin (22 yes, 5 no, and 3 sometimes) than last year, a positive response was received. Good. We can say no more than a reiteration of last year's report. "It is our opinion that a weekly plan is one of the most important segments for the success of our system. It gives the student more security and more knowledge of his responsibilities." On a larger sense, something such as a six-week outline would add direction and destination (short term goal) to classes.

4. DO YOU GIVE SPECIFIC ASSIGNMENTS FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME?

It is impossible to correctly interpret this question without taking into account question 9 (Have you initiated any long-range projects with your students?) Combined, these two questions show that almost all teachers give specific assignments or long-range projects. As we have previously mentioned IST gets its independent responsibility from the concept of choice, choice of what to study. IST should be granted and in fact is only warranted when there is an assignment pending in the particular class. The assignment can be of long-range variety.

Long-range assignments, used by 21 teachers, still remain as the ultimate in free time assignments. The long-range assignment has many advantages which turn homework into a more scholarly pursuit than daily assignments. This is not to say that daily assignments are unnecessary or even mutually exclusive with long-range assignments.

The benefits of long-range projects are:

(1) They allow the student to plan IST.
(2) They require use of special resource areas.
(3) They have the possibility of diversifying subject matter.
(4) They place responsibility on the student.

We realize that not all students can utilize this ultimate aim. Also, we would like to argue with our comment of last year in which we stated specific assignments are but a return to the traditional method. With PRISM, and in the future a PRISM encompassing all subject fields, specific assignments are a mainstay to the slow students to whom a long-range assignment becomes a crisis the day before it is due.

5. HOW OFTEN DO YOU HOLD A CLASS FOR 75-MINUTES?

The heart of the flexible schedule remains the 75-minute period. With the use of this time, the system flops or succeeds with each individual teacher. In classes tailored to the long period (science, industrial arts, music, etc.) it is a blessing, but for others it is the greatest challenge.

Fifty-minutes is the time most often attributed to the attention span of an individual. This, coupled with the fact that almost every teacher holds his class at least once a week for 75-minutes, creates a problem peculiar to South Hills High School. Last year experimentation with this time span caused many teachers to abuse its possibilities, but this year it is evident that a consensus of ideas among teachers has provided various methods of handling the time constructively.

The most constant use of the period is for seminars. Seminars provide a closer student-teacher relationship, better participation and an added variety, helping to alleviate traditional boredom. The only negative aspect which proceeds from the seminar set up (which divides the class into two groups both given about

35-minutes) is that the teacher is not available during the students IST. This causes a major stumbling block to the concept of one-to-one student-teacher relationships. Some time must be set aside by a teacher in which such a relationship can take place. The ideal time, if the teacher is not available during IST, would be the teacher's conference period. But this we must caution does not provide the equivalent opportunity that IST does, because of the simple facts that during IST

(1) there is definite availability on the part of both parties
(2) students do not feel they are infringing upon the teacher's time if they see a teacher who has given them the IST.

Another promising belief of teachers is the overall attitude that, if a class is held for the entire period, it must have "lots of variety" with strategically placed breaks. In all this praise it should not be understood that the best use is being made of this period or even that some teachers do not misuse it, but rather that progress is being made in the right direction. And progress should continue to grow if teachers, to whom the burden falls, do not lack the enthusiasm evident in this year's responses. If the enthusiasm wanes, the first victim will be this period which demands so great an effort in planning.

6. WHAT STUDENT-TEACHER RATIOS HAVE YOU EXPERIENCED?

When a question reveals nothing, it is honest to admit that it proved useless, and leave any comments on this aspect of flexible scheduling to questions eleven and twenty-two.

7. HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE SMALL GROUP ACTIVITIES?

Although there has been a significant decrease in enthusiasm, small group exercises have been able to hold the interest and hope of many teachers. Last year this aspect of flexibility was used with the hope that it would prove to be one device involving all types of students in the subject; that it would help students to verbalize and allow the teacher to better understand not only his students, but the effect of his teaching. This year it appears that the experimentation proved successful and small groups are used with acknowledgement of its benefits.

One example which shows the expanse of its use is in the Foreign Language courses. In advanced classes, small groups are used for conversational practice. This gives each individual (in a group of about 10 people) a chance to talk the language in a give-and-take situation, which is far better than in just response drills.

We also hold the belief that in such areas as math, small groups can be used to help those students who have troubles in similar areas of study. This allows the faster students to have IST and avoid the boredom of hearing what they know.

The closer the relationship between a teacher and pupil, the better the results. It is up to the teacher to show he cares, and the normal response of a student will be a better effort. In this respect as in all of the previously mentioned reasons we would have to agree with the teacher who feels that in "many ways this is the most beneficial part of the system."

8. HOW HAS THE CURRENT SYSTEM AS OPPOSED TO TRADITIONAL EXPANDED OR CONTRACTED YOUR STYLE OF TEACHING?

In a comparison of the two surveys, this year's and last year's, the response was identical. As such, the opening paragraph of last year's answer still holds the basis of our feelings:

"It is hard to believe that with the opportunities of flexible time, expanded materials, variance in group sizings and better teacher-student relationships, that all teachers have not expanded in their methods of imparting knowledge. But contrary to administrative belief that expansion is almost inevitable, half of the responses to this question came out indifferently."

What is probably the most important single fact in this report is the outcome of the correlation of this question with question thirteen: With the current system, has work sunk or risen to higher levels? Though not as pronounced as last year, when almost 100% of the teachers whose teaching expanded also felt that work had risen; this year, approximately 67% correlated in the same manner. None of the teachers in both surveys whose teaching had remained the same felt work had risen. We feel that this single fact allows us to make certain judgments which might reflect on the way teachers are handling this system.

Of those who felt this flexible system helps expand possibilities of imparting knowledge, we feel their comments are illuminating.

The system currently used at South Hills High School :

"Provides opportunity for direction and knowledge of place currently at."

"Students can be challenged to a higher degree and it is more challenging to students."

"Provides a sense of professional responsibility, variety and change."

"Student conferences frequent where once only possible."

"Now meet individual needs of more students."

But, what of other teachers, those who felt their teaching day is longer, that more planning is necessary, and above all those who are frustrated: "I feel that our school is in between a traditional school and 'modern' school. Being in

this position gives a teacher no reference points, but yet puts him in a limited position to try new ideas. This created a situation where the teacher does not feel he has direction nor a free hand to do what he wants. This creates frustration to the teacher that, I am sure, is passed on to the student."

This opinion has solid ground to stand on, and may be the reason for the drop in enthusiasm. The flexible system, while changing the role from "information giver" to manager of learning opportunities, is also adding the task of disciplinarian.

In both the traditional and college systems, the teacher's only disciplinary functions are attendance taking and in class problems; but under South Hills High School's flexible system, teachers have to worry about their students behavior while not in the class (IST). Teachers also must worry about what is the proper time to give IST with respect to facilities. In a sense they have, besides being regulators of study materials, regulators of kids, behavior, and time. We sympathize with what we feel are added teacher responsibilities but there is a price paid for progress. Very few teachers, as well as students, desire a return to the traditional system, and with the administration, they are looking forward to a college system; but they must first conquer those problems of flexibility that South Hills High School's current system presents.

Although the system "has added a lot of uncertainty to both teachers and students," it has provided greater benefits and direction for the frustration, could better be alleviated by a more cohesive faculty, but are steering their own course down a flowing river.

9. HAVE YOU INITIATED ANY LONG-RANGE PROJECTS WITH YOUR STUDENTS?

(Comments on responses included with discussion of question four).

10. HAVE YOU REQUIRED YOUR STUDENTS TO USE SPECIAL FACILITIES?

It is gratifying to see that an overwhelming majority of teachers (four to one) have required use of special facilities. The large increase over last year's responses is due in part to the introduction of PRISM, and a better understanding of the opportunities available to teachers. In fact, students have taken the initiative in using the special facilities available to them. According to personnel responsible for such facilities as the Humanities Resource Center, students have been using the area before school (on their own time).

Despite the positive responses it is our opinion that many areas are still lacking adequate facilities. The most notable deficiency is in the math department. An area staffed by at least one teacher where students of any level could work on problems and receive help, either from the teacher or supplementary tests, is a necessary addition. There is the possibility that such a set up might fail, but this can not happen until the area is operational. Similarly, a science area could be beneficial. The formation of such study areas hinges on the avail-

ability of space. We can merely point out that only on a modular system could space be provided (transformation of a classroom into a combined math-science library study area).

Another area, foreign language, which possesses one of the most flexible structures, the language lab, seems to be floundering. The language lab should be available for IST; if not, we would like to ask why. There are responsible students who could handle its operation if teachers are delinquent in their desire to do so. We also can not believe that it is in constant use by classes.

With respect to the frustration we have noticed on the part of many teachers, it is evident that this feeling runs strongest with teachers outside of the social studies and English departments. Those two departments have priority use of PRISM and a well equipped Humanities Resource Center, the ones which create overwhelming possibilities for motivated teachers. But teachers of other subject areas, noticing these advanced areas, have to cope with a frustration brought on by the lack of availability. These teachers are supposed to be creating a flexible system, yet they have mostly traditional facilities. This we feel has caused many of them to acquire directionless attitudes.

11. <u>HOW OFTEN ARE YOU AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS DURING THEIR INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME</u>?

With few exceptions, teachers are consistently available in their classrooms. Nothing could be better; nothing but the percentage of students who visit their teachers. With this overwhelming majority of what we feel is the proper response, it is evident something is wrong when fourteen teachers in response to question twenty-two feel that very few of their students use this time for conferences.

It is up to the teacher of any class to make the first move. And the first move may mean more than merely bring it to the attention of students that the teacher is available. Many students are reluctant to meet a teacher alone for many reasons--shyness, lack of responsibility, dislike of a teacher, etc. If just making students aware of the opportunity fails, a teacher should require a conference with every student. This will accomplish more than initiating contact. It can lead to a better understanding of the teacher by the student and visa-versa, provide sufficient motivation in a student who feels a teacher cares little about his progress, and give a reticent student confidence in verbalization.

Another form of teacher initiative could be an attempt to maintain an appointment sign-up sheet, but this is no substitute for a direct request.

12. <u>DO YOU GIVE EXTRA HOMEWORK WITH OUR NEW SYSTEM AS COMPARED TO THE TRADITIONAL SYSTEM</u>?

It seems that teachers, after a year of trial, have come to a conclusion

concurrent with our thought. "Our system is not designed for additional homework, but for different kinds of homework, particularly long-range projects." (1966 report) Approximately 80% do not give extra homework but different kinds. (70% have initiated long-range projects) It is a question of increased quality brought about by increased materials and a better realization of IST possibilities.

13. WITH THE CURRENT SYSTEM HAS WORK SUNK OR RISEN TO HIGHER LEVELS?

Last year we stuck our foot out: "If work has risen somewhat in our first feeble attempts at a modular schedule, how can it not help but improve with experience." We tripped, but did we fall over ourselves or were we pushed?

Where fifteen teachers felt work had risen, this year only ten were of this opinion and while no one last year, felt work had fallen off, this year two positively agreed work had decreased. Is it that the boredom we felt had disappeared from school life has returned to plague flexible scheduling; is it that many who viewed flexible scheduling as a stepping stone to a modular system are dismayed and have lost sight of their goal?

Once again evident in the responses to this question is the division of social studies and English from other fields of study. Of those who felt work has improved, the majority were in these two areas. This correlation leads to some interesting thoughts. It is apparent that the greater possibilities available in these two areas have had some effect. With regard to this we would point out PRISM, the Humanities Resource Center, and team-teaching. On the other hand we can note the frustrating lack of opportunities in other areas. This is one of our most important findings which prompts us to suggest the expansion of PRISM to all areas and the expansion of resource areas to other subject fields.

14. HOW DO YOU THINK OUR CURRENT SYSTEM CAN BE IMPROVED?

"Money" (other responses to this question are summarized under discussion of additional comments at the end).

15. HOW HAVE THE NEW AUDIO-VISUAL FACILITIES ENHANCED YOUR TEACHING?

With the scope of the PRISM project in mind (social studies and English primarily), we received 40% positive responses. All of these positive responses fell within the humanities area (except language). Though we hate to be redundant, this points up two important facts:

(1) Those who have use of PRISM have found it beneficial and,

(2) those who have not had use, seem to be frustrated and have acquired a "neglected" attitude.

Such emphatic responses as "they haven't" by math and science teachers leads us to this opinion. Another such response characteristic of this attitude is "more potential than real."

In reviewing the survey we find three questions which have bearing on the answers to this question:

8. Has system contracted or expanded your style of teaching?

13. With current system has work sunk or risen to higher levels?

26. Have you noticed an increase in class participation under the modular system?

Summary of correlation:

(a) 60% who answered yes to question 15 answered yes to all four. (Mostly Humanities teachers, except languages).

(b) 80% who answered no to question 15 answered no to all four. (Mostly math-science and language teachers).

We will assume that many of those who use PRISM have expanded their style of teaching to include it. We will assume that many teachers who use small groups have noticed an increase in class participation (see question twenty-six). And finally we will assume that if a teacher has expanded his style, grades may have risen. But we feel that it is ridiculous to overlook a composite "yes" on all four or a composite "no." We can suggest that the use of PRISM or conversely the non-use of PRISM, is a major factor in these responses. Just as rotating periods alleviate boredom from the overall schedule, PRISM relieves the class routine. And unlike any other factor in South Hills High School's flexible system it creates for non-academic students an alternative to reading and writing skills.

We would like to see PRISM expanded to all those areas where teachers feel it could be useful. Also, the project needs to be better integrated with IST accompanied by a full student orientation of its uses and possibilities. At present the facilities of PRISM are occupied mostly by students assigned there for a particular purpose. Only about 5% use the equipment while on IST. Another factor is the often overcrowded overflow. Anybody can see that what is needed to remedy most complaints is money. Money, where?

The only warning we would issue is that too much of a good thing is bad. In kindergarten listening to a story, the most academic recreation for that age group, is enjoyed the most. Why? Because of its novelty. Tapes, movies, etc., are novelties, and as long as they remain interesting they are useful, but overuse can make anything tedious, as tedious as homework is to non-academic students.

Language teachers, as a group, feel they have no use for PRISM. It is our feeling that culture is an important aspect in learning a language. If such is the case, we can see the possibilities for use of PRISM.

16. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT STUDENTS SOCIALIZING DURING IST TIME?

More teachers this year (three to one) feel that it is "part of the learning experience." With an added "if not overdone," obviously it is overdone. Therefore, the question is how to alleviate misuse while still encouraging socializing. If talking, especially academic oriented socializing, is useful it should be promoted. It is easy for us to suggest work for others, but we assume these others are interested in education. With this in mind, we suggest that at times teachers go to the cafeteria, not to view but to participate. This will allow them to get better acquainted with students, give them a chance to understand the current teenage mind, and create for the student a more intellectual atmosphere. We would also like to suggest that administrators should participate in cafeteria socializing. This would bring this group of individuals closer to the student body and their problems. In fact, such a step might eliminate our job.

It is too much for teachers and administrators to hope for spontaneous intellectualism, but just such a state of mind could be interjected by participating adults, not viewing adults.

Although the reasons for the cafeteria are obvious we would like to review them. We view this as an area where students can discuss common subject matter. This is opposite from the individual study atmosphere of other resource centers. Students, especially those who desire pure socializing, should be encouraged to make use of the grass and bench areas of the quad. Simply, that's it.

17. DO YOU TRUST YOUR STUDENTS WHEN THEY ARE ON INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME?

Why do 75% of the teachers trust their students, yet feel that use of IST is only good to fair? The only answer we can provide is that they trust students to behave; they trust students to accept the responsibility for their conduct. Also we believe that trust is a pre-requisite to good use of IST; trust creates responsibility.

18. DO STUDENTS HOPE, EXPECT, OR DEMAND INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME?

"If a teacher sets up a proper program for use of the IST, then it is natural that students should expect the time to do the work--why would they expect otherwise?" We agree, and correlations between question three and eighteen show that a large percentage of responses verify this, but not conclusively. But in a sense we have to agree with the six teachers who answered "yes." Students are different, and individuals are complex. Some expect it, some demand it,

and some hope, with or without a class plan.

Most students hope and expect IST. Those who demand should be frustrated. We would like to see in advanced classes a consensus of opinion as to what schedule a class should follow. We do not advocate a one-to-one teacher-student vote, but if students are given the opportunity to plan their schedule, they can have no other recourse but to expect what comes and be partly responsible for achievements and failures.

19. DO YOU GIVE ADVANCED CLASSES MORE INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME?

Students involved in advanced classes account for a large percentage of those 30% who use IST to its full advantage. Also, these same individuals are college-prep students. These facts coupled with the reality that advanced classes are small and often highly suited to independent study programs furnishes us with the reasons why these classes should have more IST.

IST was initiated in a high school system for only one basic reason, to enhance the possibilities for the acquisition of knowledge. If students show this potential as an actuality, we can see no reason why it is not used to its furthest educational extent.

We feel that the tally which shows that only 17 out of 27 teachers are granting more IST to advanced classes is weak.

20. HOW MUCH INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME DO YOU GRANT A WEEK PER CLASS?

Sixty minutes is the most prevalent amount of time given to a class per week (16 teachers 60 minutes, 6 teachers 30 minutes, 4 teachers 80 minutes, and 3 teachers none--art, homemaking, etc.)

With rough calculations (30 hours academic class time per week) this would give students 2/5 of the time in academic class for IST (5 hours a week.) This is what we consider to be a sufficient amount of freedom, although it should vary with each student's ability to use IST to academic advantage.

We can really make no other comments on the response, for we realize each teacher knows what amount of time is sufficient for his students. The only suggestion we would reiterate is that in advanced classes students should have a part in devising the schedule of IST.

21. HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE TEAM-TEACHING?

We realize the difficulties of scheduling similar achievement groups in one period, but we believe that it is possible for team-teaching to exist beyond groupings. Lower groups can often learn from students of a higher level. Also, exchanging of classes to give them the benefit of a teacher who has a particularly

interesting approach to a subject or has more knowledge of a question is not out of the ordinary. Teachers must become co-dependent instead of independent.

This year we note an increase of teachers who use team-teaching (this year 14, last year 9), but it is still a very small percentage and localized in the Social Studies Departments. Needless to say, most of those who use it find it beneficial.

22. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR STUDENTS VISIT YOU DURING INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME?

Last year the preponderance of teachers ranged from rarely--10%. This year 14 fell under 10% with 16 above, ranging up to 50%. The improvement is great. The need for further improvement is possibly greater. We can find no concrete reasons why the responses are weak. (For suggestions note answer to question eleven.)

23. DO YOU FEEL SPECIAL STUDY AREAS ARE ADEQUATE? IF NOT HOW COULD THEY BE EXPANDED?

24. WHAT SPECIAL FACILITIES WOULD YOU RECOMMEND FOR THE BETTERMENT OF YOUR TEACHING AREA?

True, "money" is the key to many suggestions. Also true, "space" is needed. Not having much knowledge of the budget except that it is too small, for obvious reasons, we can only comment on space.

The fact is that there is not much extra space available for needed study areas (carrells, math lab as discussed previously, etc.) Only if South Hills turns to a completely modular schedule or decreases its present enrollment can space be made available. The only alternatives are an increase in library study facilities by means of more partitions, the use of team-teaching with emphasis on employment of dividable sixties, and finally the conversion of various classrooms into study facilities during specific IST times. (A schedule of available classrooms vacated by IST published weekly.)

Many teachers feel that a way to create better areas for study is by supervision. If the administration is held to a certain number of teachers (those presently employed) then this means teachers must be the police force. But a police force displays distrust which teachers do not have of students. Also, if socializing is part of the learning experience, the cafeteria can never be used for quiet study. One can not exist with the other.

There must be some satisfactory improvement taking place, because by a count of 15 to 10, teachers felt special study areas were inadequate, whereas last year the count was 21 to 8. A major factor could be PRISM. Though small and warranting desired expansion, it is one of the areas teachers most urgently called for last year.

A last request among those who felt more texts are needed is the specific designation for culturel materials for language classes. To repeat ourselves, we feel that in this area PRISM could be very beneficial.

25. DO YOU DECREASE INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME IF A STUDENT'S WORK FALLS OFF?

By a ratio of 2 to 1, teachers do decrease IST if work falls off. This is a decrease over last year's 3 to 1 ratio. One of the reasons for this drop could be that teachers have found that cutting IST only serves to frustrate students and possibly is not the reason for poor work. It is also possible that, as one teacher puts it: "occasionally it is a good lesson for a student to 'hang himself' by misuse of time." This is, for some students, probably the only way they will comprehend the use of IST, but as the teacher says it can only be used occasionally.

If a teacher does decrease student IST, we feel this is where his task begins. The goal of any flexible system is maximum educational use of flexibility. Therefore, any cut in IST should be followed by a plan which has a goal of returning to IST.

26. HAVE YOU NOTICED AN INCREASE IN CLASS PARTICIPATION UNDER THE MODULAR (FLEXIBLE) SYSTEM?

Thirty-three percent of the teachers thought there was an improvement in class participation (10 of 30). This is a start. To correlate this increase to the use of small groups is hard, for almost all teachers use small groups. But in three cases, teachers pointed particularly to the seminar approach as being responsible. Another area that has the potential to increase verbalization is PRISM. Of those answering yes to this question, 50% use the facilities of PRISM. Considering that only 40% of teachers do use PRISM, it becomes significant that half of these teachers use audio-visual equipment. One last correlation shows that all of the teachers who saw an improvement were English and Social Studies classes. With the knowledge that these areas have the majority of special facilities at their disposal, it is evident that they have had some effect. But we must also admit that both these areas of study lend themselves to more participation than other areas.

All of these facts add up to anything but a negative view of special facilities and time arrangement. These correlations can only be used as an argument for the expansion of all facilities, especially in neglected areas.

27. IS THIS YOUR FIRST YEAR OF TEACHING UNDER A MODULAR SYSTEM?

Since we find nothing to say on this question, we will take the space to apologize for our use of the word "modular." On your second reading of this report we would suggest you make a mental substitution for this word; we feel "flexible" is quite adequate, but you may choose any favorite you have.

28. CONCLUSION.

To end our discussion of this section of the report we will incorporate any additional comments in this summary. Many points we have reiterated throughout the report might have seemed unnecessary, but we felt they were necessary. And, as such, we will now repeat the additional comments for a final time.

Many teachers still feel the need for supervised study halls. For many reasons this would be unfeasable. South Hills High School has to run its facilities with its present number of teachers, administrators, etc. Thus, supervision must be handled by the current staff, all of whom feel they have enough on their hands. There are no areas where a supervised study hall could exist without detracting from the present IST facilities, which are limited at the present time. Turning over one's students to another individual who probably has less interest in them will never accomplish the goal of total IST. As the majority of teachers felt, trust is part of the program. Signing in and out is not freedom or, as the system indicates, independence. School, especially high school, must make learning fun. It is our belief that one of the major benefits of a flexible system is the alleviation of boredom: boredom of routine, boredom of dependence, boredom of environment. The only supervision we see that is possible as well as constructive is by individual teachers holding their own students, issuing limited IST, with a gradual increase to normal time periods. Limited can be inclass work, assigned areas, or shorter time.

There is the question of whether or not students should earn IST. The answer to this question can be stated in terms of what would be lost to the system: Small group activities, student socializing ("part of learning experience"), the goal of PRISM Project, and trust, to name a few. Some developments might be boredom, teacher disenchantment with "guard duty," peer antagonisms and others which we leave to your imagination. Students at South Hills do not lack intelligence and, in fact, may have an abundance of it. What they need is maturity. Maturity is not teachable; it can only be provided with the opportunity of developing. There are probably more seniors than freshmen who use IST effectively; but does this mean we curtail the growth of freshmen or do we allow them to develop maturity within the framework of the system. Teachers must realize that only in college, not high school, do students see education as their life; those who do not desire to learn will be the same in or out of class. The only thing that can be done is to provide an atmosphere where learning is fun and adult, hoping students will be equal to the opportunity so that they will handle it in a mature manner.

At South Hills, we believe that the desire among administrators and teachers is to move toward the Stanford System. We feel this can best be accomplished by conquering the problems of the current system. Very few desire to return to traditional methods; and by noticing the trouble Claremont is having with "its system," a jump into the Stanford System might be disastrous. Maybe frustration is a necessary stage, but things can be done. If there are 20% of the student body who can use IST then put them on a course of total flexibility. In

science where laboratory work is the most beneficial aspect, put a student to work outside class on a project. Free him from drudgery work, making him responsible for his own learning, meeting with the teacher once a week. In English, divide the class giving the most advanced freedom, meeting once a week to discuss projects or weekly assignments. This generalized statement is inadequate, but its purpose is to spur the creation of flexibility within the current system by experimenting with the "20%."

SUMMARY OF STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

As in our previous survey we selected a sample group to represent the entire student body. The group from the student body consisted of an English class from each ability level of the four grades:

ZZ (top groups)	- 4 classes
Z (above average)	- 4 classes
Y (average)	- 4 classes
X (below average)	- 4 classes

The responses from the group of 400 were compiled and analyzed according to their ability rating and their experience with a flexible schedule. Although we feel that students of the same ability level will respond in a similar manner no matter what their age, we feel that some questions required a prolonged exposure to a flexible schedule and, therefore, in isolated instances the responses of a seasoned senior should bear greater weight than those of a freshman.

1. HAVE YOUR GRADES GONE UP OR DOWN?

Unfortunately, positive improvement in grade responses dropped by 15% this year to a low of only 50% of our sample group. In their analysis of student work, students agreed that the work level had leveled off or had finally started to decline. This does not mean that grades have dropped, but that improvement is decreasing. This is no great surprise when you consider that the longer a student operates under a system the closer he will come to his capacity for work. Freshmen and sophomores are also a special category never having experienced a traditional system. Further improvements can only be expected with the expansion of our current system that PRISM is attempting.

2. HOW HAVE YOUR GRADES BEEN AFFECTED BY THE MODULAR SYSTEM?

Although grade improvement dropped, over 60% of our sample group attributed their positive change to the flexible system. Most of the remaining 40% felt that the system had little if any effect on their progress.

3. IN WHAT WAYS IS OUR SYSTEM MORE OR LESS BENEFICIAL TO YOU AS COMPARED WITH THE TRADITIONAL SYSTEM?

Of the 60% that attributed their progress to the adoption of the flexible system, most agreed that the variety of daily schedule change keeps them alert and attentive. The idea that a system with the ability and resources able to develop by patterns of thought, rather than time, has finally reached its rightful position as the cause for positive results. The system has been in use for three years. The idea of attributing its results to its newness is no longer correct or appropriate.

Perhaps we should be alarmed because the percentage of grade improvements has dropped. We must remember to weigh three factors however:

(1) An overwhelming majority of the sample group has improved its grades.
(2) Teachers, perhaps eager for the permanent adoption of the new system, relaxed grading standards during its early stages. Now that the system has proven successful standards have returned to their previous high level.
(3) Students also eager for the adoption of the system increased their output to provide results. Now they too have returned to previous standards. The continued positive results therefore can only be attributed to the system itself.

4. QUESTION # 4 ASKED FOR THE STUDENT OPINION OF THE HUMANITIES RESOURCE CENTER, THE LIBRARY, THE STUDENT CENTER, AND THE AUDIO-VISUAL CENTER.

Response Groups

	X Below Average	Y Average	Z Above Average	ZZ Top Group
HRC	2nd	2nd	1st	1st
L	1st	1st	2nd	2nd
SC	4th	3rd	4th	4th
AVC	3rd	4th	3rd	3rd

5. WHAT USE HAVE YOU MADE OF:

	X	Y	Z	ZZ
HRC	3rd	1st	1st	1st
L	1st	2nd	2nd	2nd
SC	2nd	3rd	3rd	3rd
AVC	4th	4th	4th	4th

It is good to see that students have discovered the good points of our study areas and are now able to rate these areas as they were intended. It is discouraging, however, that they do not budget their time according to their area evaluation.

Several reasons should be voiced before we pass judgment on their planning:

(1) The Audio-Visual Center orientation for incoming and continuing students should be expanded and handled by the Audio-Visual Center. We cannot let an investment of thousands of dollars in equipment and personnel be lost because of poor orientation and instruction procedures. With many students unaware of the Audio-Visual Center, it is impossible to request their participation in its programs.

(2) Once again we are faced with the problem of X students spending time in the Student Center. Though a drop in their Student Center time has been notable, it is still high above desirable amounts.

Most teachers indicate that IST is granted to the student in accordance with his ability rating. Therefore, X students receive the least amount of IST. The natural tendency would be to head for a break at the Student Center--which is probably what many do. Possible remedies that we can see would be: Use of text books in the library; this would gradually pull more X students from the Student Center into the more formal setting of the Library. Greater exposure to an academic setting such as the Library would gradually acclimate X students to this type of academic atmosphere. Hopefully these students would eventually graduate to the even more formal setting of the Humanities Resource Center.

Obviously, we cannot place the entire blame of student planning on their shoulders. Lack of student participation in orientation procedures, poor introduction of equipment and minor points such as the supervisor typing in the supposedly quiet Humanities Resource Center and a lack of enough copies of the teacher recommended books in the Library are not the fault of the students.

6. <u>WHAT EQUIPMENT IN THE AUDIO-VISUAL CENTER IS BEST SUITED TO YOUR NEEDS?</u>

Few students were able to answer this question. Of those who did, however, tape recordings appear to be the most popular, mainly because they are able to review teacher lectures that they had missed or misunderstood. Unfortunately this is only one aspect of the Audio-Visual Center. The ideas of learning the same material from a different viewpoint, or learning new material in addition (much like reading an outside text) have not as yet been touched. Better administration procedures and teacher initiative are the only solution to this problem, besides the ever present need for more money.

7. THE STUDENT CENTER IS PRIMARILY:

Increased knowledge of the purpose of this facility on the part of the student body is apparent in the responses to this question. The evaluation of the Student Center increased from a 3 to 2 ratio to a 5 to 1 ratio that the Student Center is primarily for brunch. Most of those evaluating the Student Center as a brunch area were of the two upper classes. Unfortunately, lower classmen feel that the Student Center is suitable for study. The solution to this problem lies in the type of orientation that the administration and faculty are willing to give and carry out. We would like to see this area used for group study or intellectual socializing, but until the orientation and acceptance of this idea is recognized it will remain a brunch facility.

8. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER THE OUTSTANDING CHARACTERISTICS OF OUR CURRENT SYSTEM?

Once again a pattern of responses was established by our sample group. Their rating is as follows:

1. Independent Study Time
2. Rotating periods
3. Flexible time
4. Resource Center
5. Availability of teachers
6. Audio-Visual Services

We previously predicted that the top three would lose their lead. They have, but they have retained their positions with minor changes in order. Flexible time and rotating periods are beginning to lose their glitter and consequently are beginning to fall. IST, however, is the essence of flexible scheduling and deserving of its number one place in their evaluations. As time goes by and students begin to accept the flexible system as permanent, they will take its educational innovations for granted.

9. DO YOU FEEL YOUR TEACHERS HAVE HANDLED THIS SYSTEM CORRECTLY?

Students agreed by a 4 to 1 ratio that teachers have handled the problems and promises of the system correctly. Comments regarding suggested teacher improvements included better organization and increased consistency in lecture and class organization. If students of the higher groups were given a share of the responsibility for organization, a new wave of enthusiasm could be generated which would help to carry along the potential of the system. No matter how students feel, teachers have handled what faces them, they have their own ideas. Involvement is the best educational atmosphere.

10. WHAT DO YOU DO DURING INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME?

Much like question five, question ten requests a student report of his time allotment.

	X	Y	Z	ZZ
Socialize	1st	2nd	2nd	2nd
Resource Center	2nd	1st	1st	1st
Eat	3rd	3rd	4th	4th
A-V Center	4th	4th	3rd	3rd

A definite problem does exist with X students who still spend most of their time socializing in IST. Although their time in the Resource Center has finally surpassed that spent eating food, a problem still exists in selection of their number one "time waster." A basic dilemma exists in the solution of this problem: (1) Should IST for X students be cut and therefore eliminate their chance to waste time, and also their opportunity of learning how to work independently; or (2) Increase IST for X students and therefore eliminate the short IST sessions that lean so heavily and frequently toward socializing.

Our solution is to retain the present IST rates and add a more extensive IST program for X students. Additional research work, required time in the Resource Centers and class time in the Audio-Visual Center would greatly aid in making the X student more at ease in academic surroundings. Once this is accomplished, complete IST could be reestablished with the hope that the student would remain in his new surroundings.

11. WHAT COULD BE DONE TO IMPROVE OUR SYSTEM:

Increased flexibility, IST and teacher participation once again ranked as the top three for necessary improvements in the flexible system. And most likely for the same reasons.

(1) Students have found that the combin ation of these three has produced the best results in positive changes of their grades. With the increased emphasis on grades under the new system, it only seems natural that students want more of what they term a good thing.
(2) Though the PRISM grant has greatly aided in the improvement of the audio-visual facilities, it has failed if it continues not to involve itself in the student orientation program.
(3) If the object of flexible scheduling remains that of training students for college or an increased freedom after high school, then we must continue to follow this policy in all areas of our academic program. Long-term projects designed to encourage individual research are a basic point of this policy. Unfortunately these projects involve extra work and planning; and, therefore, lack polularity with students. Though the student questionnaire drastically disagrees, we feel that

the number of long term projects should be increased. With IST and Resource Centers available no excuse exists for failure to complete a project. Teachers, however, must first require their students to use all areas.

12. WHAT SPECIAL FACILITIES SHOULD BE ADDED TO ENHANCE THE SYSTEM?

Most students realize by now that the facilities are available and, consequently, we received few serious replies to this question. The only continuous request was one for covered walkways to ward off the rain. Few, however, claimed that this addition would increase academic output.

13. HOW HAS YOUR HOMEWORK LOAD BEEN AFFECTED BY OUR SYSTEM?

14. HOW HAS YOUR HANDLING OF HOMEWORK BEEN AFFECTED BY OUR CURRENT SYSTEM?

Three-fifths of our sample students felt that the homework load was just right as compared to two-fifths who claimed they were overloaded. Half of the sample group responded that they completed their homework at school. In a sense this is as it should be, but we can envision a larger percentage who have no homework of the "due next day" variety. Under the flexible system we would like to see "homework" reversed for long-range projects or weekly assignments. If a student can do his daily work at school where he can find help, he will receive greater benefits than being told the next day he has a wrong answer. This 50% total could also indicate that procedures used to instruct students in the use of IST need to be improved.

15. HOW COULD TEACHERS BEST USE A 75 MINUTE PERIOD?

A plea for increased class variety was the overwhelming response despite the fact that most teachers claimed that this was one of their chief methods of attack. Students are willing to admit that a 75-minute class usually becomes a 75-minute waste of time. Attention and efficiency levels begin dropping as soon as the class learns of a 75-minute lecture. This problem could be greatly alleviated by increased planning and the establishment of different combinations of IST, group discussions, films, and lectures. We feel the increased acceptance of these ideas would aid in the improvement of (1) student work levels; (2) discipline problems. A correlation between teacher responses and student responses shows disparaging attitudes. Teachers felt that they were handling the class as the students wished, with lots of variety and strategically placed breaks. It is impossible for us to find any concrete reasons for the diverging opinions. We can only say that students often merely remember the bad classes, forgetting those which pass by quickly and without injury.

16. DO YOU APPRECIATE A TEACHER WHO GIVES YOU A WEEKLY PLAN?

Weekly class plans once again received a mandate from the students, though most indicated that they liked variety and last minute class changes. They also appreciate the benefits of planning around a semi-definite class plan. The skill of budgeting one's time is one of the better gains that can be achieved through a flexible schedule. With the need to plan ahead for IST and the benefits of experience in budgeting time, it is good to see that students have learned to appreciate, and teachers have learned to present, class plans.

17. IF YOU HAVE EXPERIENCED TEAM-TEACHING, DO YOU FIND IT BENEFICIAL?

Last year a lack of student experience with team-teaching prevented an evaluation of this question. Fortunately, this year we received enough answers to establish a one-to-one ratio of students for, as compared to students against, team-teaching. We were also fortunate to receive more specific comments regarding this area than any other area on campus. Perhaps this increased response should be noted as a sign of student interest to see the area improved. It appears that their interest needs only to be encouraged by better organization.

Those in favor of the team-teaching concept praised it not only for the variety it put in their day, but also for the increased exposure to different views of the same question. The idea behind team-teaching, therefore, has obviously been put across. Many, however, looked beyond the main idea to suggest minor improvements in order to refine this new teaching technique. The correction or elimination of the problems they have discovered would most likely gain their support.

Their complaints included poor organization, lack of teacher preparation, mixing of capability groups (which we feel can be done if correctly planned), and conflicting emphasis on tests. The first two obviously concern the quality of our teachers and, therefore, should be isolated for administrative concern and control. Class mixing and tests, however, directly effect students and, therefore, deserve comment.

Top-achievers resent being talked down to as much as low-achievers are frustrated by a speaker who lectures high above their level of comprehension. Resentment usually creates a lack of interest that will consequently "turn off" the students' minds. The entire period, therefore, is lost. If it is impossible to group classes of the same achievement level to experience team-teaching, then teachers should make a conscientious effort to aim their presentations down the middle. If both ideas fail, then perhaps the whole idea of team-teaching should be scrapped rather than waste the time of disappointed teachers and disgusted and disinterested students.

When a speaker selects a topic, he also decides on an approach and an area of major importance for his speech. With this in mind it only seems reasonable that the concepts he wishes to convey should be under his control. It is fine to request a guest speaker to cover topics of importance; a team-

teacher, however, is not a guest speaker but rather a person responsible for the education of the team's entire group of young people. Tests, therefore, should be uniform with the speaker in charge of the basic format of the test that covers his lesson. It is ridiculous for one teacher to test his students on parts of a lesson he feels important when the speaker placed emphasis on entirely different areas. Students commented that unorganized classes were a major weak point of team-teaching. The alleviation of this problem in testing methods would have a positive effect on student acceptance and appreciation of team-teaching. With these two goals achieved the possibilities of team-teaching would be endless.

18. HOW DO YOU RATE YOURSELF IN USE OF INDEPENDENT STUDY TIME?

Although grade improvements have leveled off, most students judge themselves as "good" users of IST. Considering that in the past survey where grades increased 15% more than this year and only 50% of the students considered themselves "good" users, it seems rather discrediting to the validity of this years questionnaire. Before we hasten to conclusions however, we should consider two basic problems.

Freshmen and sophomores of the past year were not involved in the original planning of the flexible system. Combining this with the poor orientation program that students have complained about, we have a large portion of our student body and, consequently, a large portion of our survey group that not only lacks the understanding of IST, but also the vantage point from which to judge their performance. Before we place the blame entirely on the shoulders of the administration, we would like to make the point that often theories of the use and meaning of IST are handed out randomly by teachers. With each teacher comes a different view, which often only serves to cloud those ideas the student has already formed. In this case orientation should be handled by one body without needless confusing repetition.

Secondly, many students who have shown that they are not able to handle IST have experienced a decrease in their free time. IST is therefore no longer part of the program for them, but a special reward. Because it is a reward and break from monotony, most of these students treat it as such by taking a five, ten or fifteen minute break. The question is whether we should increase IST to acquaint students with its possibilities and its part in the program, or we should cut IST and wait until we feel students are able to conduct themselves properly before its reestablishment. As a high school student we would have to agree with the former. As observers we feel an increase of IST, with the firm understanding that it is on a trial basis, would solve the problem of student conduct and appreciation of IST.

It is only after increased exposure to IST that students will be able to judge themselves and their performance. Once they acquire the skill of self appraisal half the goals of flexible scheduling will have been achieved. This skill will never be obtained by continued cuts and regulation of IST.

19. AFTER GRADUATION I PLAN TO: (Excerpts from letter to Ray Cortines from Ron Filene)

"Rather than evaluate I would merely like to warn the Board of Regents, the California State School System and the taxpayers.

"The values of a Flexible System for a four-year college bound student.

"The system I experienced last year had no direct effects and provided no outstanding experiences which helped me so far at college. Independent Study has no correlation to residence living, simply because, when I finish a class I do not spend my time in the academic center; instead, I return to my dorm room--my home. The type of study I do at the university is much like a high school student does when he returns home after school. I would now temper this by saying that IST teaches time management which is beneficial anywhere.

"Then why should this type of system continue in high school! Off hand I would list four outstanding benefits:

(1) It cuts boredom, which in my opinion is the strongest deterrent to education.
(2) It is probably a great help to future junior college students who learn how to effectively use free time between classes.
(3) It allows college bound students greater flexibility. The greatest gift of the college bound student is a mind eager for creativity of itself. This is either through intercourse of ideas between people or just brousing the library.
(4) The total effect of the above three and other aspects which help grades use.

I would now like to continue on what I think high school should teach and what in most cases, they don't teach (this should be understood in view of the fact that I am a four-year college student).

(1) How to think
(2) How to talk
(3) How to write
(4) How to study
(5) Broad, general view of various fields of study

(1) HOW TO THINK. High school is most like a tape recorder. Somebody or some book feeds you information and plays it back on tests and whatever else is necessary for a grade. What is the traditional use of geometry--to teach logic. But high school geometry is given in the narrow view that you take it to get to Algebra 3-4. Why not teach a course in logic and use geometry, or teach a course of geometry showing the part it plays in logic by going off the path into philosophy, for example. In fact, why not a class entitled "Bull Session."

Nobody just lets the mind wander in productive thought connected with nothing that a student is supposedly learning at that time. The future of anybody in this world depends on thought (only through thought is responsibility created).

(2) HOW TO TALK. I would start by saying speech class should be mandatory. Man is a social animal and if one cannot effectively converse he becomes left behind. Today's society makes man totally dependent on others and the only way he can hold his own is by communication. Also, many people can have thoughts, yet they will benefit no one unless they can be voiced. Even at Stanford, the West Coast's Hallmark of Intellectualism, I've come across too many people who can only describe things as good--bad or beautiful-ugly.

(3) HOW TO WRITE. This probably comes under the same category as "how to talk." I would have to say, that of any of the things I would have to see taught in high school, this is the closest to actuality. I got 'A's" in double Z (the highest) English class, yet at Stanford the first quarter I got C's.

(4) HOW TO STUDY. Why not a course entitled "How to Study" which would include all of the above mentioned topics, plus, use of library reference materials and any other educational services or facilities.

(5) High school should offer a wide range of topics from which a student could get an overview of what is available to him in college. This is probably done (by personal initiative) to a great extent. To get into Stanford this is necessary, but why then does a student have to repeat this work in all fields under a general studies program. There exists in America a very wide gap between high school and college. I have learned no more about logical procedure from a college lab-science than I did from a similar high school course."

APPENDIX

Reply by April 30, 1967
Return to PRISM Office

Name (if desired)_____
Subject area_____

SOUTH HILLS HIGH SCHOOL
STUDENT REPORT ON MODULAR SCHEDULING

SURVEY ON MODULAR SCHEDULING
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your opinion of student use of Independent Study Time?

   Excellent_____ Good_____ Fair_____ Poor_____
   Comments:

2. Do you instruct your students in the proper use of Independent Study Time?

3. Do you provide your students with a weekly class plan?

4. Do you give specific assignments for Independent Study Time?

5. How often do you hold your class for 80 minutes?

   Twice weekly_____ Once weekly_____ Never_____

   How do you handle the time?

6. What student-teacher ratios have you experienced?

   Which is the best?

7. How often do you use small group activities?

   Consistently_____ Occassionally_____ Never_____

   If used, do you find them beneficial?

8. How has the current system as opposed to a traditional system expanded or contracted your style of teaching?

9. Have you initiated any long-range projects with your students?

10. Have you required your students to use special facilities?

    In what respect?

11. How often are you available to students during their Independent Study Time?

Consistently_____ Occasionally_____ Never_____

At what location do you avail yourself?

Teacher's lounge_____Classroom_____Resource Center_____Other_____

12. Do you give extra homework with the new system as compared to the traditional system?

13. With the current system has work sunk or risen to higher levels?

14. How do you think the current system could be improved?

15. How have the new audio-visual facilities enhanced your teaching?

What types of equipment do you prefer?

16. How do you feel about students socializing during Independent Study Time?

Wasteful_____ Part of learning experience_____ No opinion_____

Comments:

17. Do you trust your students when they are on Independent Study Time?

18. Do students hope, expect, or demand Independent Study Time?

19. Do you give advanced classes more Independent Study Time?

20. How much Independent Study Time do you grant a week per class?

30 min,_____ 60 min, _____ 80 min._____ none_____ either_____

21. How often do you use team-teaching?

Constantly_____ Occassionally_____ Never_____

How do you use it?

Do you find it beneficial?

22. What percentage of your students visit you during Independent Study Time?

23. Do you feel special study areas are adequate?

    If not, how could they be expanded?

24. What special facilities would you recommend for the betterment of your teaching area?

25. Do you decrease Independent Study Time if a student's work falls off?

26. Have you noticed an increase in class participation under the modular system?

27. Is this your first year of teaching under a modular system?

28. Additional comments:

SOUTH HILLS HIGH SCHOOL
STUDENT REPORT ON MODULAR SCHEDULING

SURVEY ON MODULAR SCHEDULING
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Have your grades gone up or down?

2. How have your grades been affected by the modular system?

3. In what ways is our system more or less beneficial to you as compared with the traditional system?

4. What is your opinion of: (check more than one if desired)

Humanities Resource Center
beneficial_____ not necessary_____
good for research_____ good for studying_____
other_____

Library
beneficial_____ not necessary_____
good for research_____ good for studying_____
other_____

Student Center
beneficial_____ not necessary_____
good for research_____ good for studying_____
other_____

Audio-Visual Center
beneficial_____ not necessary_____
good for research_____ good for studying_____
other_____

5. What use have you made of:

Humanities Resource Center
large amount_____ some use_____ hardly any_____ none_____
Library
large amount_____ some use_____ hardly any_____ none_____
Student Center
large amount_____ some use_____ hardly any_____ none_____
Audio-Visual Center
large amount_____ some use_____ hardly any_____ none_____

6. What equipment in the Audio-Visual Center is best suited to your needs?

   Why?

7. The student Center is primarily
   for brunch_____ studying_____
   for socializing_____ other_____

8. What do you consider the outstanding characteristics of our current system?

   Resource Center_____Rotating periods_____Flexible time_____
   IST_____Availability of teachers_____Audio-Visual services_____
   other_____

9. Do you feel your teachers have handled this system correctly?

   If not, how could they improve?

10. What do you do during Independent Study Time ?

    Socialize_____Eat food_____Use Resource Center constantly_____
    Use Audio-Visual Center_____Other_____

11. What could be done to improve our system?

    More flexibility_____More IST_____
    More long-range assignments_____
    Audio-visual aids_____Better teacher participation_____

    Comments:

12. What special facilities should be added to enhance the system?

13. How has your homework load been affected by our system?
    Overloaded_____Just right_____Not enough_____
    Other_____

14. How has your handling of homework been affected by our current system?

    Completed at school_____Done at home_____
    other_____

    Comments:

15. How could teachers best use an 80 minute period?

16. Do you appreciate a teacher who gives you a weekly plan?

Yes_____No_____Indifferent_____

17. If you have experienced team-teaching, do you find it beneficial?

18. How do you rate yourself in use of Independent Study Time?

Excellent_____Good_____Fair_____Poor_____

19. After graduation I plan to: (check more than one if you wish)

_____Get married
_____Attend a junior college
_____Attend a trade or technical school
_____Join the Armed Forces
_____Attend a four-year college
_____Work
_____Get drafted(?)

As everything else connected with the flexible schedule employed at South Hills High School, this report at its outset is merely a collection of thoughts and ideas. This is as far as we can go; though we feel these ideas are serious considerations, it remains for you to weigh the value of this report as it furnished useful and pertinent material beneficial to your performance as administrators, teachers, and students.

While we attended South Hills High School and participated in its schedule we had many thoughts and ideas, and carried out our part as students in accordance with these feelings. But today we feel differently, because we no longer have the same perspective. We could express these views, yet they are primarily more intelligible to ourselves than to others, for we have lived with the entire process: administration, faculty, and student. This is what you must do if you are to succeed; you must step away and gain a perspective that will enable you to understand your concept of the system in the terms of all those involved. Then, and only then, will your thoughts and ideas become the productive actualities that are needed to meet this educational challenge.

Ron Filene - Gary Kief
Co-Chairmen
Students Report on Modular Scheduling

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Project PRISM was made possible by a grant of funds to the district by the United States Office of Education in accordance with the provisions of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, Sections 991-908) for the grant period from July 1, 1966 through June 30, 1968, with the possibility of renewal for a third year.

Ramon C. Cortines - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - PRISM Director

Steve Serrurier - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - PRISM Instructional Media Technician

Joan Kotsenburg - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - PRISM Secretary

Joseph I. Deal - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Principal, South Hills High

Richard B. Ross - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Asst. Principal, South Hills High

For further information write or call PRISM Project, Covina-Valley Unified School District, P.O. Box 269, Covina, California 91722, (213) 331-3371.